

# Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com



E-ISSN: 2278-4136 P-ISSN: 2349-8234 www.phytojournal.com JPP 2020; 9(6): 1024-1026 Received: 21-07-2020 Accepted: 29-09-2020

#### SA Ambore

P.G. Students, Department of Agronomy Section, College of Agriculture, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

#### DJ Jiotode

Associate Professor, Department of Agronomy Section, College of Agriculture, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

#### A.I. Shinde

P.G. Students, Department of Agronomy Section, College of Agriculture, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

## VS Khawale

Associate Professor, Department of Agronomy Section, College of Agriculture, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

## AN Gawate

P.G. Students, Department of Agronomy Section, College of Agriculture, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

# Corresponding Author: SA Ambore

P.G. Students, Department of Agronomy Section, College of Agriculture, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

# Crop weather relationship studies under different sowing windows in black gram (*Phaseolus mungo* L.)

# SA Ambore, DJ Jiotode, AJ Shinde, VS Khawale and AN Gawate

#### **Abstract**

The field investigation entitled "Crop weather relationship studies in Black gram (*Phaseolus mungo* L.) under different sowing windows" was carried out during kharif season 2019-20 at Research Farm of College of Agriculture, Nagpur to study the. The experiment was laid out in split plot design with four sowing dates *viz*. D<sub>1</sub> (26<sup>th</sup> MW), D<sub>2</sub> (27<sup>th</sup> MW), D<sub>3</sub> (28<sup>th</sup> MW) and D<sub>4</sub> (29<sup>th</sup> MW), and three varieties *viz*. V<sub>1</sub> (TAU-1), V<sub>2</sub> (AKU-15) and V<sub>3</sub> (Yashoda-58). Yield attributing character *viz*. number of pod plant<sup>-1</sup>, weight of dry pod plant<sup>-1</sup>, grain yield plant<sup>-1</sup>, test weight, straw yield, biological yield and harvest index recorded maximum in sowing on 26<sup>th</sup> MW and variety TAU-1 and the influence of relative humidity requirement of sowing on 26<sup>th</sup> MW and variety TAU-1 were not noticed on yield of crop.

Keywords: Black gram, Phaseolus mungo L., varieties and sowing windows

## Introduction

Black gram is native to India (Vavilov, 1926) [7]. The progenitor of black gram is believed to be Vigna mungo var. silvestris. Black gram belongs to the family Fabaceae and the genus Vigna. Only seven species of the genus are cultivated as pulse crops, five Asian species of subgenus Ceratropis, Vigna mungo (black gram), V. radiata (mung bean), V. aconitifolia (mothbean), V. angularis (Azuki bean) and V. umbellate (rice bean) and two African species of subgenus Vigna, Vigna unguiculate (cowpea) and V. subterranean (the Bambara groundnut) (Verdcourt, 1969) [8]. Black gram (Vigna mungo L. Hepper) is a member of the Asian Vigna crop group. It is a staple crop in the Central and South East Asia however, it is extensively used only in India and now grown in the Southern United States, West Indies, Japan and other tropics and subtropics. Black gram, the 3rd important crop group, was cultivated over an area of 5.44 Mha (kharif + rabi) and recorded a production of 3.56 Mt at productivity level of 655 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. This was the highest ever area, production and productivity in this crop. Major contributing states are MP, Rajasthan, AP, UP, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Jharkhand and Gujarat. Black gram crop is also gaining momentum since 2015-16 and there has been phenomenal increase in its coverage. During 2017-18 the crop was cultivated over an area of >50 Lha. The success of this crop was released with a harvest of about 35 Lt at an ever highest yield levels of 352 kg/ha. There is a mention of black gram in Vedic texts such as Kautilya's "Arthashashtra" and "Charak Samhita". The ancient Sanskrit name of black gram was masha. Even today in Punjab, black gram is called mash and in West Bengal, it is called mash kalaya. In all other Indian languages, the name urd is used, which seems to have originated from the Tamil word ulundu. Vigna mungo is the Latin name of black gram (Nene, 2006) [3].

# **Materials and Methods**

A field experiment was conducted to study the "Crop weather relationship studies in Black gram (*Phaseolus mungo* L.) under different sowing windows", during *kharif* season of 2019-2020 at Agronomy Farm, College of Agriculture, Nagpur. Soil of the experimental site was loamy clay in texture, medium in available nitrogen, phosphorous and Sulphur and rich in available potash. Organic carbon content was medium and soil reaction was slightly alkaline. The experiment was laid out in split plot design with 12 treatments with four sowing dates viz. D<sub>1</sub> (26<sup>th</sup> MW), D<sub>2</sub> (27<sup>th</sup> MW), D<sub>3</sub> (28<sup>th</sup> MW) and D<sub>4</sub> (29<sup>th</sup> MW), and three varieties viz. V<sub>1</sub> (TAU-1), V<sub>2</sub> (AKU-15) and V<sub>3</sub> (Yashoda-58) replicated thrice.

Three varieties of black gram namely TAU-1, AKU-15 and Yashoda-58 were sown in four different dates to evaluate the optimum sowing date for *kharif*. Black gram. Sowing of black gram was done by manually, keeping 30 cm distance between the rows.

# Result and Discussion Yield attributes and yield

The data given in Table no. 1 revealed that sowing during 26th MW recorded maximum number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (26.44), weight of dry pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (10.13), grain yield plant<sup>-1</sup> (7.02) and test weight (42.22 g) were significantly superior over 28th MW and 29th MW, however, it was at par with 27th MW. This might be due to less flower drop and more fruit setting during kharif season Similar results were also reported by Ali et al. (2014) [1] and Yagoub and Hamed (2013) [10] who inferred these favourable effect of sowing times on grain yield in black gram. Variety TAU-1 recorded maximum number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (25.80), weight of dry pods plant<sup>-1</sup> (9.47), grain yield plant<sup>-1</sup> (6.33) and test weight (41.53 g) were significantly superior over Yashoda-58, however, it was at par with AKU-15. This might be attributed due to genetic makeup of cultivar, more number of branches plant-1 that helped in production of more number of matured or reproductive pods. These results are close in conformity with Patel and Munda  $(2001)^{[4]}$ .

The grain yield (9.31 q ha<sup>-1</sup>), straw yield (13.30 q ha<sup>-1</sup>) and harvest index (41.17) were significantly highest at sowing during 26<sup>th</sup> MW over 28<sup>th</sup> MW and 29<sup>th</sup> MW, but found at par with 27<sup>th</sup> MW. This might be due to higher number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup>, number of seeds plant<sup>-1</sup>, seed weight plant<sup>-1</sup> and thousand seed weight. Similar results were also observed by

Yadahalli and Palled (2004) <sup>[9]</sup> and Singh and Kumar (2014) <sup>[5]</sup>. Among varieties, TAU-1 produced highest grain yield (8.50 q ha<sup>-1</sup>), straw yield (12.30q ha<sup>-1</sup>) and harvest index (40.86) were significantly superior over Yashoda-58 and it was at par with AKU-15. This might be due to higher number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup>, number of seeds plant<sup>-1</sup>, seed weight plant<sup>-1</sup>. This is confirmation with the results of Tekale *et al.* (2011) <sup>[6]</sup> and Singh and Kumar (2014) <sup>[5]</sup>. Interaction effect between sowing dates and varieties was found to be non-significant.

## **Economics**

The data given in Table no. 1 revealed that sowing on 26<sup>th</sup> MW recorded maximum Net monetary return (Rs. 48108 ha<sup>-1</sup>), Gross monetary return (Rs. 66373 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and B:C ratio (3.63) were significantly superior over 28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> MW, however, it was at par with 27<sup>th</sup> MW. Similar results were also reported by Kumar *et al.* (2008) <sup>[2]</sup>. Among the different varieties TAU-1 recorded highest Net monetary return (Rs. 42485 ha<sup>-1</sup>) and Gross monetary return (Rs. 60750 ha<sup>-1</sup>) were significantly superior over variety Yashoda-58, however, it was at par with AKU-15. It is also revealed that maximum B:C ratio was recorded in TAU-1 (3.32). Obtained result was also confirmed by matching finding of Kumar *et al.* (2008) <sup>[2]</sup>. Interaction effect of sowing dates and different varieties on yield and economics was found to be non-significant.

| Table 1: Yield attributes and yield of black gram as influenced by various treatments |      |          |       |             |      |             |             |         |   |  |
|---|------|----------|-------|-------------|------|-------------|-------------|---------|---|--|
| o. of   | pods | Weight o | f dry | Grain yield | Test | Grain yield | Straw yield | Harvest | 6 |  |

| Sr. | Treatments                 | No. of pods Weight of dry |                          | Grain yield         | Test   | Grain yield        | Straw yield        | Harvest | GMR Rs.            | NMR                    | B:C   |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|--------------------|---------|--------------------|------------------------|-------|
| No. | Treatments                 | plant <sup>-1</sup>       | pods plant <sup>-1</sup> | plant <sup>-1</sup> | weight | q ha <sup>-1</sup> | q ha <sup>-1</sup> | index   | q ha <sup>-1</sup> | Rs. q ha <sup>-1</sup> | Ratio |
| A   | Sowing dates               |                           |                          |                     |        |                    |                    |         |                    |                        |       |
|     | $D_1 - 26^{th} \ MW$       | 26.44                     | 10.13                    | 7.02                | 42.22  | 9.31               | 13.30              | 41.17   | 66373              | 48108                  | 3.63  |
|     | $D_2-27^{th}\;MW$          | 24.82                     | 9.00                     | 5.96                | 40.76  | 7.99               | 11.97              | 40.03   | 57503              | 39238                  | 3.14  |
|     | $D_3$ - $28^{th}$ MW       | 24.20                     | 8.38                     | 5.16                | 39.89  | 7.27               | 11.03              | 39.72   | 52453              | 34188                  | 2.87  |
|     | $D_4-29^{th}\;MW$          | 23.62                     | 8.02                     | 4.87                | 39.27  | 6.60               | 10.13              | 39.45   | 47753              | 29488                  | 2.61  |
|     | S.E. (m) ±                 | 0.52                      | 0.38                     | 0.33                | 0.52   | 0.41               | 0.51               | -       | 2715               | 2715                   | -     |
|     | C.D. at 5%                 | 1.80                      | 1.34                     | 1.14                | 1.81   | 1.44               | 1.76               | -       | 9394               | 9394                   | -     |
| В   | Varieties                  |                           |                          |                     |        |                    |                    |         |                    |                        |       |
|     | $V_1$ - TAU-1              | 25.80                     | 9.47                     | 6.33                | 41.53  | 8.50               | 12.30              | 40.86   | 60750              | 42485                  | 3.32  |
|     | V <sub>2</sub> – AKU-15    | 24.97                     | 8.83                     | 5.85                | 40.23  | 7.81               | 11.70              | 40.03   | 56208              | 37990                  | 3.07  |
|     | $V_3-Ya shoda \hbox{-} 58$ | 23.55                     | 8.35                     | 5.07                | 39.83  | 7.07               | 10.83              | 39.49   | 51105              | 32840                  | 2.79  |
|     | S.E. (m) ±                 | 0.38                      | 0.23                     | 0.21                | 0.45   | 0.24               | 0.38               | -       | 1503               | 1503                   | -     |
|     | C.D. at                    | 1.16                      | 0.71                     | 0.62                | 1.36   | 0.73               | 1.14               | -       | 4510               | 4510                   | -     |
| C   | Interaction                |                           |                          |                     |        |                    |                    |         |                    |                        |       |
|     | S.E. (m) ±                 | 0.77                      | 0.47                     | 0.42                | 0.90   | 0.48               | 0.76               | -       | 3006               | 3006                   | -     |
|     | C.D. at 5%                 | NS                        | NS                       | NS                  | NS     | NS                 | NS                 | -       | NS                 | NS                     | -     |
|     | G. M.                      | 24.77                     | 8.88                     | 5.75                | 40.39  | 7.79               | 11.60              | 40.10   | 56021              | 37763                  | 3.06  |

# Conclusion

Sowing of black gram during 26<sup>th</sup> MW and variety TAU-1 recorded significantly high yield attributing characters *viz.* number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup>, weight of dry pods plant<sup>-1</sup>, grain yield plant<sup>-1</sup>, test weight, grain and straw yield plant<sup>-1</sup> and harvest index. Sowing of black gram during 26<sup>th</sup> MW and variety TAU-1 recorded significantly highest Gross monetary return, Net monetary return and B:C ratio.

# Reference

- 1. Ali Saif, Khaliq T, Ahmad A, Muzammal R, Hussain S, Rehman K *et al.* Genotypic variation in mungbean yield and its attributes in response to different sowing times. Res. J Agric, Environ. Management 2014;3(5):255-258.
- 2. Kumar R, Tomar GS, Kumawat N, Singh SP. Effect of varieties, plant density and molybdenum on yield and economics of black gram under rainfed conditions of Chhattisgarh 2008;6(1):1867-1870.

- 3. Nene YI. Indian pulse through the millennium, Asian Agri-History 2006;10(3):179-202.
- Patel DP, Munda GC. Growth pattern and yield potential of some promising cultivars of black gram (*Vigna mungo* L.) under rainfed mid-hills of Meghalaya. Crop-Research-Hissar 2001;21(2):130-133.
- 5. Singh M, Kumar R. Effect of date of sowing and seed rate on the growth and yield of *kharif* mash (*Vigna mungo* L.) Agric.Sci. Digest 2014;34(3):211-214.
- 6. Tekale CD, Patel DD, Dongre RS, Patil SD. Performance of green gram (*Vigna radiata* L.) cultivars under different datews of sowing. Bioinfolet 2011;8(4):415-416.
- Vavilov NI. Origin and geography of cultivated plants. J Agri. Sci 1926;21(1):142-142.
- 8. Verdcourt AS, Madhavan L. Heterochromatin distribution and comparative karyo-morphological studies in Vigna umbellata. J Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry 1969;9(5):24-25.

- 9. Yadahalli GS, Palled YB. Response of black gram genotypes to dates of sowing and phosphorus level in northen transitional tract of Karnataka. Karnataka. J Agri. Sci 2004;17(2):215-219.
- 10. Yagoub SO, Hamed HM. Effect of sowing date on two genotypes of soybean (Glycine max. Merrill.) grown under semi-desert region. Universal J Agril. Res 2013;1(3):59-64